

created a certain bias against recognizing new Indian tribes. Second, the process has always been too expensive, costing some tribes well over \$500,000, and most of these tribes just do not have this kind of money to spend. I need not remind my colleagues of the fact that Native American Indians today have the worst statistics in the nation when it comes to education, economic activity and social development. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the recognition process for the First Americans has been an embarrassment to our government and certainly to the people of America. If only the American people can ever feel and realize the pain and suffering that the Native Americans have long endured, there would probably be another American revolution.

Mr. Speaker, the process to provide federal recognition to Native American tribes simply takes too long. I acknowledge the recent reaffirmation of a federal trust relationship for the King Salmon Tribe (Alaska), the Shoonag' Tribe of Kodiak (Alaska), and the Lower Lake Rancheria (California), and the recognition of Chinook Indian Tribe/Chinook Nation of Washington. This is a step in the right direction, but recognition for the Chinooks took 22 years, and the other three tribes were somehow "overlooked" by the BIA for a number of years. I thank former Assistant Secretary Kevin Gover for acknowledging this "egregious oversight", and then correcting it. Regrettably, even at the current rate of recognition, it will take the Bureau of Indian Affairs many decades to resolve questions on all tribes which have expressed an intent to be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, the current process does not provide petitioners with due process—in particular, the opportunity to cross examine witnesses and on-the-record hearings. The same experts who conduct research on a petitioner's case are also the "judge and jury" in the process!

In 1996, in the case of *Greene v. Babbitt*, 943 F. Supp. 1278 (W.Dist. Wash.), the federal court found that the current procedures for recognition were "marred by both lengthy delays and a pattern of serious procedural due process violations. The decision to recognize the Samish tribe took over twenty-five years, and the Department has twice disregarded the procedures mandated by the APA, the Constitution, and this Court," (p. 1288). Among other statements contained in Judge Thomas Zilly's opinion were: "The Samish people's quest for federal recognition as an Indian tribe has a protracted and tortuous history . . . made more difficult by excessive delays and governmental misconduct." (p. 1281) And again at pp. 1288-1289, "Under these limited circumstances, where the agency has repeatedly demonstrated a complete lack of regard for the substantive and procedural rights of the petitioning party, and the agency's decision maker has failed to maintain her role as an impartial and disinterested adjudicator . . ." Sadly, the Samish's administrative and legal conflict—much of which was at public expense—could have been avoided were it not for a 30-year-old clerical error of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which inadvertently left the Samish Tribe's name off the list of recognized tribes in Washington.

With a record like this, it is little wonder that many tribes have lost faith in the Govern-

ment's recognition procedures. Former President Clinton acknowledged the problem. In a 1996 letter to the Chinook Tribe of Washington, the President wrote, "I agree that the current federal acknowledgment process must be improved." He said that some progress has been made, "but much more must be done."

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today addresses most the above concerns by establishing an independent three member commission which consider petitions for recognition. This legislation will provide tribes with the opportunity for public, trial-type hearings and sets strict time limits for action on pending petitions. Previous bills I have introduced on this issue were an attempt to streamline and make more objective the federal recognition criteria by aligning them with the legal standards in place prior to 1978, as laid out by the father of Indian Law, Felix S. Cohen in 1942.

Because some have expressed concern that prior bills would open the door for more tribes to conduct gambling operations on new reservations, the bill I introduce today will codify the existing criteria used for recognition rather than change to revised criteria under which some have said would make it easier for groups to qualify.

Underlying this bill is the issue of Indian gaming. While I cannot say that no new gambling operations will result from this bill, I do believe that this bill will have only a minimal impact in the area. I would like to remind my colleagues that:

(1) unlike state-sponsored gaming operations, Indian gaming is highly regulated by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act;

(2) before gaming can be conducted, the tribes must reach an agreement with the state in which the gaming would be conducted;

(3) under IGRA (the Indian Gaming and Regulatory Act) gaming can only be conducted on land held in trust by the federal government;

(4) gaming can only be conducted at a level the state permits on non-Indian land; and

(4) any gaming profits can only be used for tribal development, such as water & sewer systems, schools, and housing.

The point I want to make is even if an Indian group wanted to obtain recognition to start a gambling operation, they couldn't do it just for that purpose. For a group to obtain federal recognition, it would still have to prove its origins, cultural heritage, existence of governmental structure, and everything else currently required.

Should that burden be overcome, a tribe would need a reservation or land held in trust by the federal government. This bill makes no effort to provide land to any group being recognized.

If the land issue is overcome, under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, a tribe cannot conduct gaming operations unless it has an agreement to do so with the state government. A prior Congress put this into the law in an effort to balance the rights of the states to control gambling activity within its borders, and the rights of sovereign tribal nations to conduct activities on their land. The difficulty in obtaining gaming compacts with states made the national news not long ago because of the almost absolute veto power the states have under current law. The U.S. Supreme Court

affirmed this reading of the law in *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44 (1996).

I want to emphasize this point—this is not a gambling bill, this is a bill to create a fair, objective process by which Indian groups can be evaluated for possible federal recognition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect in every form, but it is the result of many hours of consultation and years of work. I have sought to work with many parties to come up with sound, careful changes which recognize the historical struggles the unrecognized tribes have gone through, yet at the same time recognizes the hard work the Bureau of Indian Affairs has done lately in making positive changes through regulations to address these problems.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I hope we can take final action on the issue of Indian recognition early in this century by addressing at least some of the wrongs of the past two centuries.

#### FLAG ISSUE

#### HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 2001

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I submit the following article for the RECORD.

(By Roy E. Barnes, Governor, to Georgia House of Representatives)

Forty years ago, faced with court orders to integrate and with demonstrations by Georgians who wanted the University of Georgia and the state's public schools closed instead, the people who stood in our places did the right thing.

The schools stayed open.

And Governor Ernest Vandiver told the General Assembly that, unless Georgia faced up to the issue and moved on, it would "devour progress—consuming all in its path—pitting friend against friend demoralizing all that is good—stifling the economic growth of the state."

We have a great deal to be proud of as Georgians—our history, our heritage, our state's great natural beauty—but nothing should make us prouder than the way Georgia has led the South by focusing on the things that unite us instead of dwelling on those that divide us.

While the government of Arkansas used the armed forces of the state to prevent nine black students from enrolling at Little Rock's Central High School, while the Governor of Alabama stood defiantly in a schoolhouse door, Georgia quietly concentrated on growing our economy, on the goals that bring us together rather than those that can tear us apart.

And, in the process, Georgia established itself as the leader of the New South.

Forty years ago, Birmingham was about the same size as Atlanta, and Alabama's population and economy were almost as big as ours.

Georgia moved ahead because its leaders looked ahead.

Anyone who doesn't realize that's why Georgia has become the fastest growing state east of the Rocky Mountains does not understand economic development.

I am a Southerner.

My wife is named May-REE.

I like collard greens with fried streak-o-lean, catfish—tails and all, fried green tomatoes, cat head biscuits and red eye gravy.

My heart swells with pride when I see a football game on a crisp fall Saturday.

I still cry when I hear Amazing Grace.

My great grandfather was captured at Vicksburg fighting for the Confederacy, and I still visit his grave in the foothills of Gilmer County.

I am proud of him.

But I am also proud that we have come so far that my children find it hard to believe that we ever had segregated schools or separate water fountains labeled "white" and "colored."

And I am proud that these changes came about because unity prevailed over division.

Today, that same effort and energy of unity must be exercised again.

The Confederate Battle Flag occupies two-thirds of our current state flag.

Some argue that it is a symbol of segregation, defiance, and white supremacy. Others that it is a testament to a brave and valiant people who were willing to die to defend their homes and hearth.

I am not here to settle this argument—because no one can—but I am here because it is time to end it.

To end it before it divides us into warring camps, before it reverses four decades of economic growth and progress, before it deprives Georgia of its place of leadership—in other words before it does irreparable harm to the future we want to leave for our children.

As Governor Vandiver said four decades ago this month: "That is too big a price to pay for inaction."

"The time has come when we must act—act in Georgia's interest—act in the future interest of Georgia's youth."

And, as Denmark Groover—Governor Marvin Griffin's floor leader and the man who assured adoption of the current flag in 1956 told the Rules Committee this morning:

"This is the most divisive issue in the political spectrum, and it must be put to rest."

Denmark Groover is right. It is time to put this issue to rest and to do so in the spirit of compromise.

This morning the House Rules Committee passed out a bill to make Georgia's flag represent Georgia's history—all of Georgia's history.

Both personally and on behalf of the people of Georgia, I want to thank Calvin Smyre, Larry Walker, Tyrone Brooks, and Austin Scott for their work to bring the people of Georgia together.

The Walker Rules Committee substitute takes the original Georgia flag—the Great Seal of Georgia set against a background of blue—and adds a banner showing all of Georgia's other flags. It has the National Flag of the Confederacy and the Confederate Battle Flag, as

The bill also has a provision preserving Confederate monuments and says our current state flag should be displayed in events marking Georgia's role in the Confederacy.

To those who say they cannot accept this because the Confederate flag is still in the banner, you are wrong. The Confederacy is a part of Georgia's history.

To those who say they are opposed to this because it changes the current flag, you are wrong also. The Confederacy is part of our history, but it is not two-thirds of our history.

It is time to honor my great grandfather and the Georgians of his time by reclaiming the flag they fought under from controversy and division.

The Walker Rules Committee substitute preserves and protects our heritage, but it

does not say that, as Southerners and as Georgians, the Confederacy is our sole reason to exist as a people.

Defeating this compromise will confirm the worst that has been said about us and, in the process, dishonor a brave people.

Adopt this flag and our people will be united as one rather than divided by race and hatred.

Adopt this flag and we will honor our ancestors without giving aide to those who would abuse their legacy.

Georgia has prospered because we have refused to be divided.

We have worked together, and the nation and the world have taken notice.

We are where we are today, the envy of other states, because decades ago our leaders accepted change while others defied it.

In the long run, it has paid us handsome dividends.

Today, the eyes of the nation and the world are on us again to see whether Georgia is still a leader or whether we will slip into the morass of past recriminations.

I have heard all the reasons not to change the flag and adopt this compromise: "it will hurt me politically"; "this is how we can become a majority"; "this is our wedge issue"; "this is the way we use race to win."

Using race to win leaves ashes in the mouths of the victors.

If there is anything we should have learned from our history, it is that using racial bigotry for political advantage always backfires. Sometimes in the short run, sometimes in the long run. Often both.

And if you allow yourself to be dragged along in its raging current—even if only briefly—you will live the rest of your life regretting your mistake.

I know.

Seventeen years ago this General Assembly debated whether to make the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. a state holiday.

Many of the arguments I heard then I hear again today.

"What will they want next?"

"You know you can't satisfy them."

The argument that gave the most political cover was "Martin Luther King was a great man, but we already have enough holidays, and we don't need any more."

I was a young state senator, and my calls and constituents, for whatever reason, were against the King Holiday. I knew it was the right thing to do, but I was so worried about my political future that I did what many legislators do: when the vote came up, I had important business elsewhere.

I knew instantly I'd made a mistake. So when the bill came back to the Senate for agreement, I voted for it.

I was immediately besieged by constituents; so on final agreement, I voted against it.

There is not a day that goes by that I do not regret that vote.

Fortunately, there were enough leaders in this General Assembly then with the wisdom and the fortitude that I lacked as a young legislator.

Don't make my mistake.

Each of you knows the right thing to do.

You know it in your heart.

You know it in your mind.

You know it in your conscience.

And, in the end, that is all that matters.

When the dust settles and controversy fades, will history record you as just another politician or as a person of conscience?

Make no mistake, just as with me and a vote almost 20 years ago, history will make a judgment.

Robert E. Lee once said "it is good that war is terrible, otherwise men would grow fond of it."

This is not an issue upon which we should have war.

Our people do not need to bleed the color of red Georgia clay.

This is an issue that demands cool heads and moderate positions.

Preserving our past, but also preserving our future.

And not allowing the hope of partisan advantage to prohibit the healing of our people.

Like most of you, I am a mixture of old and new, of respect and honor for the past, and of hope for the future.

The children of tomorrow look to us today for leadership.

If we show them the courage of our convictions, they will one day honor us as we honor the true leaders of decades past.

Do your duty—because that is what God requires of all of us.

## CELEBRATING DETROIT'S TRICENTENNIAL

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 2001

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is time to celebrate the City of Detroit. This year Detroit turns 300 years young, and we are presently in the midst of a year long celebration commemorating the City's founding. As a Detroitier, I am proud of the contributions our City has made to the State of Michigan and the Nation.

Detroit is the oldest major city in the Midwest. It began as a small French community along the Detroit River when Antione de la Mothe Cadillac founded a garrison and fur trading post on the site in 1701.

Over the last three centuries, Detroit has played a pivotal part in our Nation's development. It was a key staging area during the French and Indian War, and one of the key areas which inspired early Americans to move westward.

In the 19th Century, the City was a vocal center of antislavery sentiment. It played an important role on the road to freedom for tens of thousands of African-American slaves who sought refuge in Canada by means of the Underground Railroad.

Detroit is best known perhaps for the industrial center that put the Nation on wheels. Because of entrepreneurs of the likes of Henry Ford, automobiles were made affordable to people of average incomes. Automotive transportation was no longer a privilege of the wealthy. With the invention of the Model T, many working Americans found it within their means to purchase an automobile.

With its growth as an industrial center, Detroit also played a central role in the development of the modern-day labor movement. I am proud that Detroit is home of the United Automobile Workers Union, the UAW, and many other building, service and industrial trades unions, including the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Although Detroit's association with the automobile industry earned it the nickname of